



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

27

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,126	03/27/2001	James H. Errico	KLR 7146.107	3921

47915 7590 04/08/2005

CHERNOFF, VILHAUER, MCCLUNG & STENZEL, LLP
1600 ODS TOWER
601 SW SECOND AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

FISH, JAMIESON W

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2616

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,126

Applicant(s)

ERRICO, JAMES H.

Examiner

Jamieson W. Fish

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status11 June

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 6-15-2001 has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim contains a footnote. If applicant wishes to have the content of the footnote considered content must be incorporated into claim language. Appropriate correction is required. See 37 CFR 1.75.
3. Claims 27, 31-32 are objected to because of the following informalities: "determined" should be replaced with "determined." Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities: "informations" should be replaced with "information." Appropriate correction is required.
5. Claim 39 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim should end with a period not a semi-colon. Appropriate correction is required.
6. Claim 45 is objected to because of the following informalities: "the number of times that a preselected set of preferences, less that all of said preferences, corresponds with said program attribute information, wherein said at least one of said audio and video receives a higher ranking with an increasing said number" is repeated twice." The second occurrence along with "further characterized by" should be eliminated. Appropriate correction is required.

7. Claim **52** is objected to because of the following informalities: "raking" should be replaced with "ranking." Appropriate correction is required.
8. Claim **54** is objected to because of the following informalities: line 7: "a first a" second "a" should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.
9. Claim **62** is objected to because of the following informalities: line 1: "or" should be replaced with "are." Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

10. Applicant is advised that should claims **33-38** be found allowable, claims **19-24** will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

11. Applicant is advised that should claims **40-44** be found allowable, claims **45-49** will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k). Claim **45** simply repeats the limitations found in claim **40**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2616

13. Claim **12** recites the limitation "said second attribute information" in line 3 and "said first attribute information" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear whether "second (first) attribute information" refers to user attribute information or program attribute information. It appears as though applicant is trying to calculate rankings based on specific attribute values. The examiner has replaced "said second attribute information" with "a second attribute information" and "said first attribute information" with "a first attribute information" to evaluate what the applicant appears to be claiming.

14. Claim **16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear how the "said second program attribute information" can both "include" and be "free from said third attribute." The claim has been evaluated with "and is free from said third attribute" omitted.

15. Claim **58** recites the limitation "said threshold value" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

17. Claim **1-4, 6-16, 19-39, 54-55, 57-58, 60-69** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Graves (US 5,410,344).

18. Regarding claim 1, Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (See Abstract): (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences wherein said user attribute information includes preferences (See Fig. 4 Step 36 Col. 4 lines 41-51 Col. 6 lines 17-52); (b) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of said audio and video, where said program attribute information corresponds with said user preferences, where at least one of said user attribute information and said program attribute information includes hierarchical levels (See Fig. 4 Step 34, Fig. 8 Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 lines 5-65 x (Top level) is determined based on sum of A's (lower level)); and (c) determining the desirability of said at least one of said audio and video based upon said preferences (See Fig. 4 Step 40 Col. 6 lines 17-52), wherein said preferences selectively include data indicative of at least a first, a second, and a third option; (i) said first option including a preference indicative of the desirability of said at least one of audio and video; (ii) said second option including a preference indicative of non-desirability of said at least one of audio and video; (iii) said third option including a preference indicative of indifference desirability of said at least one of audio and video (From the specification Page 122 lines 5-23, Page 123 lines 1-5 Data indicative of options is a value and the option is determined simply by a numeric range the value falls within. Preferences in Graves' system receive are weighted (See Col. 7 lines 45-66 Col. 8 lines 5-46). Various weights would inherently fall within various numeric ranges (options). Thus, Graves meets the limitations of the claim).

19. Regarding claim 2, Graves teaches wherein said first option is a non-binary preference value (See Fig. 5 Col. 7 Lines 49-54 Weights are based on numbers with values 1-10).
20. Regarding claim 3, Graves teaches wherein said second option is a non-binary preference value (See Fig. 5 Col. 7 Lines 49-54 Weights are based on numbers with values 1-10).
21. Regarding claim 4, Graves teaches wherein said first option is positive preference value (See Fig. 5 Col. 7 Lines 49-54 Weights are based on numbers with values 1-10).
22. Regarding claim 6, Graves teaches wherein said preferences are adjustable by a user (See Fig. 5, Fig. 6 and Col. 6 lines 60-68, Col. 7 lines 1-36).
23. Regarding claim 7, Graves teaches wherein said preferences include at least one default value (See Col. 5 lines 44-50 Default values are inherent to initial loading of personal preference value).
24. Regarding claim 8, Graves teaches wherein said preferences are adjustable by a user (See Fig. 5, Fig. 6 and Col. 6 lines 60-68, Col. 7 lines 1-36).
25. Regarding claim 9, Graves teaches wherein said determining results in a value (See Col. 7 lines 45-66 Col. 8 lines 5-46 Programs evaluated by Graves' system receive a grade (value) based on an equation).
26. Regarding claim 10, Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (See Abstract): (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences wherein said user attribute information includes

preferences (See Fig. 4 Step 36 Col. 4 lines 41-51 Col. 6 lines 17-52); (b) receiving first program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of said audio and video, where said first program attribute information corresponds with said user preferences, where at least one of said user attribute information and said first program attribute information includes hierarchical levels (See Fig. 4 Step 34, Fig. 8 Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 lines 5-65 The overall grade of the program, x (Top level), is determined based on sum of A's (lower level)); (c) receiving second program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of said audio and video, where said second program attribute information corresponds with said user preferences, where at least one of said user attribute information and said second program attribute information includes hierarchical levels (See Fig. 4 Step 34, Fig. 8 Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 lines 5-65 The overall grade of the program, x (Top level), is determined based on sum of A's (lower level)); and (c) determining the desirability of said at least one of said audio and video based upon a relative ranking between said first program attribute information and said second program attribute information (See Col. 6 lines 17-52).

27. Regarding claim **11**, Graves teaches wherein said determining the desirability includes: (a) calculating a first ranking value for said first program attribute information (See Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 Eqn. 1); (b) calculating a second ranking value for said second program attribute information (See Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 Eqn. 1); and (c) determining said relative ranking based upon said first ranking value and said second ranking value (See Col. 6 lines 17-52).

28. Regarding claim **12**, Graves wherein said determining the desirability includes: (a) calculating a first ranking value for said first program attribute information which is based in part upon a second attribute information (See Col. 8 Eqn 1 Ranking value is calculated based on all i (attribute information), so ranking for first program attribute information would be based in part upon $i=2$ (second attribute information)); (b) calculating a second ranking value for said second program attribute information which is based in part upon a first attribute information (See Col. 8 Eqn 1 Ranking value is calculated based on all i (attribute information), so ranking for first program attribute information would be based in part upon $i=1$ (first attribute information)); and (c) determining said relative ranking based upon said first ranking value and said second ranking value (See Col. 6 lines 17-52).
29. Regarding claim **13**, Graves teaches wherein said determining the desirability includes and operation where, (a) said first program attribute information includes a first attribute and free from a second attribute (See Fig. 3, Fig. 5, Col. 4 lines 52-67, Col. 5 lines 1-62 Attributes are independent of one another. For example, Story Appeal is rated separately from Actor #1); (b) said second program attribute information includes said first attribute and said second attribute (See Fig. 3, Fig. 5 A second program could contain both attributes i.e. Story appeal and Actor #1); and (c) said determining said relative ranking indicates said second program as more desirable than said first program (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1 Based on the weighting and values of each attribute a second program could receive a higher ranking than a first program).

30. Regarding claim **14**, Graves teaches wherein said determining the desirability includes and operation where, (a) said first program attribute information includes a first attribute and free from a second attribute (See Fig. 3, Fig. 5, Col. 4 lines 52-67, Col. 5 lines 1-62 Attributes are independent of one another. For example, Story Appeal is rated separately from Actor #1); (b) said second program attribute information includes said first attribute and a relatively smaller presence of said second attribute in comparison to said first attribute (See Fig. 3, Fig. 5 A second program could have a smaller value for one attribute versus another i.e. Actor #1 has a smaller value than Story appeal); and (c) said determining said relative ranking indicates said second program as more desirable than said first program (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1 Based on the weighting and values of each attribute a second program could receive a higher ranking than a first program).

31. Regarding claim **15**, Graves teaches wherein said determining the desirability includes and operation where, (a) said first program attribute information includes a first attribute and a second attribute, where said second attribute has a first relatively smaller presence than said first attribute in said first program (See Fig. 3, Fig. 5 A program could have a smaller value for one attribute versus another i.e. Actor #1 has a smaller value (weight) than Story appeal); (b) said second program attribute information includes said first attribute and said second attribute, where said second attribute has a second relatively smaller presence than said first attribute in said second program, where said first relatively smaller presence is smaller than said second relatively smaller presence (See Fig. 3, Fig. 5 A program could have a smaller value for one attribute

versus another i.e. Actor #1 has a smaller value(weight) than Story appeal and a program could have a smaller value for an attribute when compared to that value for that attribute of another program); and (c) said determining said relative ranking indicates said second program as more desirable than said first program (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1 Based on the weighting and values of each attribute a second program could receive a higher ranking than a first program).

32. Regarding claim **16**, Graves teaches wherein said determining the desirability includes and operation where, (a) said first program attribute information includes a first attribute and free from a second attribute and free from a third attribute (See Fig. 3, Fig. 5, Col. 4 lines 52-67, Col. 5 lines 1-62 Attributes are independent of one another); (b) said second program attribute information includes said second attribute and said third attribute (See Fig. 3, Fig. 5 A second program could contain both a second and a third attribute); (c) said determining said relative ranking indicates said first program as more desirable than said second program (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1 Based on the weighting and values of each attribute a first program could receive a higher ranking than a first program).

33. Regarding claim **19**, Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising: (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences, wherein said user attribute information includes hierarchical levels (See Fig. 4 Step 34, Fig. 8 Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 lines 5-65 x (Top level) is determined based on sum of A's (lower level)); (b) receiving programs attribute information corresponding to said at least one of a first audio and first video (See Fig. 4 Step 34

Art Unit: 2616

Col. 6 lines 17-52); (c) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of a second audio and second video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); and (d) ranking said at least one of said first audio and first video, and, said at least one of said second audio and second video, in response to receiving said user attribute information and said program attribute information for said at least one of said first audio and first video, and, said at least one of said second audio and second video, based upon less than all of said hierarchical levels (See Col. 4 lines 64-68, Col. 5 lines 1-5, Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 Eqn. 1 Programs are ranked based on grade, x . This is only one level in the hierarchy. Ranking based on one level out of two is ranking based on less than all levels. Also, if programs receive the same grade the one that has been stored longer receives a lower rank).

34. Regarding claim **20**, Graves teaches wherein said ranking determines said first video as more desirable for said user than said second video (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1 Based on the weighting and values of each attribute a first program could receive a higher ranking than a second program).

35. Regarding claim **21**, Graves teaches wherein said ranking determines said second video is more desirable for another user than said first video (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1 Based on the weighting and values of each attribute a second program could receive a higher ranking than a first program).

36. Regarding claim **22**, Graves teaches wherein said less than all of said hierarchical levels includes a single branch (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1, If $n = 1$ Top level (x) would only have one branch).

37. Regarding claim **23**, Graves teaches wherein said less than all of said hierarchical levels includes a plurality of branches (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1, If $n > 1$ Top level (x) would have a plurality of branches).

38. Regarding claim **24**, Graves teaches wherein said less than all of said hierarchical levels are ranked based upon a relativistic manner (See Col. 6 lines 17-52).

39. Regarding claim **25**, Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising: (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences, wherein said user attribute information includes a plurality of preference values (See Abstract Col. 5 lines 44-67, Col. 6 lines 1-16); (b) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of an audio and a video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); and (c) evaluating said user attribute information and said program attribute information by determining: (i) a first score when a portion of said user attribute information matches a portion of said program attribute information and said first score is based at least in part upon one of said preference values (See Col. 8 Eqn 1 A first score is calculated, $i = 1$); (ii) a second score when another portion of said user attribute information matches another portion of said program attribute information and said second score is based at least in part upon one of said preference values (See Col. 8 Eqn 1 A second score is calculated, $i = 2$); (iii) a composite score based, at least in part, upon said first score and said second score (See Col. 8 Eqn 1 Scores are added).

40. Regarding claim **26**, Graves teaches wherein said evaluating is free from combining multiple preference values into a single composite preference value (See

Art Unit: 2616

Col. 8 Eqn 1. Preference values are combined to make a composite score not a single composite preference value).

41. Regarding claim **27**, Graves teaches wherein a said composite score is determined for a plurality of said videos, and said video are ranked based, at least in part, upon said composite scores. (See Col. 6 lines 17-52).

42. Regarding claim **28**, Graves teaches wherein said composite score is determined free from comparing said first score and said second score (See Col. 8 Eqn 1 The composite score is the sum of the first score and the second score. Summing is free from comparison).

43. Regarding claim **29**, Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (See Abstract): (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences, wherein said user attribute information includes a plurality of preferences that are arranged in a hierarchy to form a preference template where a plurality of said preferences includes a preference test and a preference value (See Fig. 4 Step 34, Fig. 8 Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 lines 5-65 x (Top level) is determined based on sum of A's (lower level) preference test is the operation of multiplying value by weight); (b) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of an audio and a video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); and (c) evaluating said user attribute information and said program attribute information by determining: (i) a first score when a portion of said user attribute information matches a portion of said program attribute information and said first score is weighted based upon the respective said preference values (See Col. 7 lines 37-68, Col. 8 lines 1-51 First

Art Unit: 2616

score is determined when $i = 1$ in Equation 1); (ii) a second score when another portion of said user attribute information matches another portion of said program attribute information and said second score is weighed based upon the respective said preference values (See Col. 7 lines 37-68, Col. 8 lines 1-51 Second score is determined when $i = 2$ in Equation 1); (iii) a composite score based, at least in part, upon said first score and said second score (See Col. 7 lines 37-68, Col. 8 lines 1-51 Eqn. 1. Composite score is the sum); (iv) repeating steps (i)-(iii) for a plurality of said program attribute information (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1 i can equal any multiple of two); (v) sorting at least one of said audio and video associated with said programs attribute recommendations (See Col. 6 lines 17-52).

44. Regarding claim **30**, Graves teaches wherein said evaluating is free from combining multiple preference values into a single composite preference value (See Col. 8 Eqn 1. Preference values are combined to make a composite score not a single composite preference value).

45. Regarding claim **31**, Graves teaches wherein a said composite score is determined for a plurality of said videos, and said video are ranked based, at least in part, upon said composite scores (See Col. 6 lines 17-52).

46. Regarding claim **32**, Graves teaches wherein said composite score is determined free from comparing said first score and said second score (See Col. 8 Eqn 1 The composite score is the sum of the first score and the second score. Summing is free from comparison).

47. Regarding claim **33**, Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (See Abstract): (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences, wherein said user attribute information includes hierarchical levels (See Fig. 4 Step 34, Fig. 8 Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 lines 5-65 x (Top level) is determined based on sum of A's (lower level)); (b) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of a first audio and first video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); (c) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of a second audio and second video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); and (d) comparing in a relativistic manner said at least one of said first audio and first video, and, said at least one of said second audio and second video, in response to receiving said user attribute information and said program attribute information for said at least one of said first audio and first video, and, said at least one of said second audio and second video, based upon less than all of said hierarchical levels (See Col. 4 lines 64-68, Col. 5 lines 1-5, Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 Eqn. 1 Programs are ranked based on grade, x. This is only one level in the hierarchy. Ranking based on one level out of two is ranking based on less than all levels. Also, if programs receive the same grade the one that has been stored longer receives a lower rank).

48. Regarding claim **34** Graves teaches wherein said comparing determines said first video as more desirable for said user than said second video (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1 Based on the weighting and values of each attribute a first program could receive a higher ranking than a second program).

49. Regarding claim **35**, Graves teaches wherein said comparing determines said second video as more desirable for another user than said first video (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1 Based on the weighting and values of each attribute a second program could receive a higher ranking than a first program).

50. Regarding claim **36**, Graves teaches wherein said less than all of said hierarchical levels includes a single branch (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1, If $n = 1$ Top level (x) would only have one branch).

51. Regarding claim **37**, Graves teaches wherein said less than all of said hierarchical levels includes a plurality of branches (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1, If $n > 1$ Top level (x) would have a plurality of branches).

52. Regarding claim **38**, Graves teaches wherein said less than all of said hierarchical levels are ranked based upon a relativistic manner (See Col. 6 lines 17-52).

53. Regarding claim **39**, the USPTO considers the applicant's "at least one of" language to be anticipated by any reference containing any of the subsequent corresponding elements. Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (See Abstract): (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences, wherein said user attribute information includes preferences (See Col. 5 lines 44-68, Col. 6 lines 1-16); (b) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of an audio and video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); (c) ranking said at least one of said audio and video, in response to receiving said user attribute information and said program attribute information for said at least one of said audio and video, based upon at least one of the following

characteristics: (i) the number of times that one of said preferences corresponds with said program attribute information, wherein said at least one of said audio and video receives a higher ranking with an increasing said number (See Col. 5 lines 6-9 See Col. 8 Eqn. 1 The amount of time an actor is on screen determines the A value. The higher the A value, the higher the x value (ranking)); (ii) the number of times that a preselected set of preferences, less than all of said preferences, corresponds with said program attribute information, wherein said at least one of said audio and video receives a higher ranking with an increasing said number; (iii) the number of times that one of said preferences corresponds with said program attribute information, wherein said at least one of said audio and video receives a higher ranking with a decreasing said number; (iv) the number of times that a preselected set of preferences, less than all of said preferences, corresponds with said program attribute information, wherein said at least one of said audio and video receives a higher ranking with a decreasing said number.

54. Regarding claim 54 Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (See Abstract): (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences, wherein said user attribute information includes preferences (See Col. 5 lines 44-68, Col. 6 lines 1-16); (b) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of an audio and video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); (c) evaluating said user attribute information and said program attribute information by determining a first value based upon, at least in part, a first portion of said user attribute information matches a portion of said program attribute information and second a portion of said user attribute information matches a portion of

said program attribute information (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1 programs are evaluated for attributes $i=1$ to n); (d) after said evaluating, discarding said at least one of said audio and video, in response to receiving said user attribute information and said program attribute information for said at least one of said audio and video, as a desirable said at least one of audio and video for said user based upon a threshold value (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 The threshold value is the grade of the lowest ranked program).

55. Regarding claim **55**, Graves teaches wherein said threshold value is a fixed value (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 The grade of the lowest ranked program (threshold value) is fixed for at least some portion of time).

56. Regarding claim **57**, Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (See Abstract): (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences, wherein said user attribute information includes preferences (See Col. 5 lines 44-68, Col. 6 lines 1-16); (b) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of an audio and video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); (c) evaluating said user attribute information and said program attribute information by: (i) determining a first value based upon, at least in part, a first a portion of said user attribute information matches a portion of said program attribute information (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1 programs are evaluated for attributes $i=1$ to n . The value for $i=1$ is the first value), and (ii) determining a second value based upon, at least in part, a second portion of said user attribute information matches a portion of said program attribute information (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 Col. 8 Eqn. 1

programs are evaluated for attributes $i=1$ to n The value for $i=2$ is the second value); (d) discarding said at least one of said audio and video, in response to receiving said user attribute information and said program attribute information for said at least one of said audio and video, as a desirable said at least one of audio and video for said user based upon if at least one of said first value or said second value indicates non-desirability of said at least one of audio and video (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 The program with the lowest grade is discarded); (e) if said at least one of audio and video is not discarded as a result of step (d) then determining a third value based upon, at least in part, said first value and said second value (See Col. 6 lines 46-49 If two programs share a common grade one program the time the two programs have been stored is compared. The length of time a program is stored is based on the programs grade compared to other programs. The grade is based on the first value and the second value. Thus, the time a program is stored is based upon the first value and second value).

57. Regarding claim **58**, Graves teaches wherein said threshold value is a fixed value (See Col. 6 lines 17-52 The grade of the lowest ranked program (threshold value) is fixed for at least some portion of time).

58. Regarding claim **60**, Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (See Abstract): (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences, wherein said user attribute information includes hierarchical levels, wherein said user attribute information includes preferences (See Fig. 4 Step 34, Fig. 8 Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 lines 5-65 x (Top level) is determined based on sum of A 's (lower level); (b) receiving program attribute information

corresponding to said at least one of an audio and a video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); and (c) evaluating said at least one of said audio and video, in response to receiving said user attribute information and said program attribute information based upon, (i) a first set of a plurality of preferences wherein said first set is evaluated based upon a first operator (See Col. 8 lines 5-68, Col. 9 lines 1-3); (ii) a second set of a plurality of preferences wherein said second set is evaluated based upon a second operator (See Col. 8 lines 5-68, Col. 9 lines 1-3); (iii) wherein said first set and said second set are evaluated independent of the number of preferences of said first set and said second set (See Col. 8 lines 5-68, Col. 9 lines 1-3 First set and second set are simply partitions of Graves elements 1 to n such partitioning does not effect outcome of Graves' equation. Thus, the limitations of this claim are anticipated by Graves).

59. Regarding claim **61**, Graves teaches wherein at least one of said first operator and said second operator is an "OR" function (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1). From the specification the "OR" function is a summation (Page 135 line 1).

60. Regarding claim **62**, Graves teaches wherein said first operator and said second operator are "OR" functions (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1).

61. Regarding claim **63**, Graves teaches wherein said first set and said second set depend from the same preference within said hierarchy (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1 The first set and second set are on the same level of the hierarchy and depend from the overall preference).

62. Regarding claim **64**, Graves teaches wherein said first set and said second set have a different number of preferences (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1 i values 1 to n could be an odd number divided into two sets).

63. Regarding claim **65** Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (See Abstract): (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences, wherein said user attribute information includes hierarchical levels, wherein said user attribute information includes preferences (See Fig. 4 Step 34, Fig. 8 Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 lines 5-65 x (Top level) is determined based on sum of A's (lower level)); (b) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of an audio and a video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); and (c) evaluating said at least one of said audio and video, in response to receiving said user attribute information and said program attribute information based upon, (i) a first set of a plurality of preferences wherein said first set is evaluated based upon a first operator (See Col. 8 lines 5-68, Col. 9 lines 1-3); (ii) a second set of a plurality of preferences wherein said second set is evaluated based upon a second operator (See Col. 8 lines 5-68, Col. 9 lines 1-3); (iii) wherein said first set and said second set are evaluated based on a ratio functionality (See Col. 8 lines 5-68, Col. 9 lines 1-3 First set and second set are simply partitions of Graves elements 1 to n such partitioning does not effect outcome of Graves' equation. Each set is evaluated by weighing and adding individual elements of the set. This is ratio functionality. Thus, the limitations of this claim are anticipated by Graves).

64. Regarding claim **66**, Graves teaches wherein at least one of said first operator and said second operator is an "OR" function (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1). From the specification the "OR" function is a summation (Page 135 line 1).

65. Regarding claim **67**, Graves teaches wherein said first operator and said second operator are "OR" functions (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1).

66. Regarding claim **68**, Graves teaches wherein said first set and said second set depend from the same preference within said hierarchy (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1 See Col. 8 Eqn. 1 The first set and second set are on the same level of the hierarchy and depend from the overall preference).

67. Regarding claim **69**, Graves teaches wherein said first set and said second set have a different number of preferences (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1 i values 1 to n could be an odd number divided into two sets).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

68. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

69. Claims **5, 17, 18, 40-53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graves in view of Herz (US 6,020,883).

70. Regarding claim **5**, Graves differs from claim 5 in that Graves fails to disclose where program attribute weights can take on negative values (See Figs. 5 and 6 Col. 8 Eqn. 1). However, using negative program attribute weights in television program

ranking systems is well known in that art as taught by Herz (See Col. 10 lines 31-63 cv is equivalent to Graves' w). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Graves so that user could assign negative values to attribute weights as taught by Herz to allow the user to express a level of aversion to a program attribute (See Herz Col. 10 lines 60-63).

71. Regarding claim 17, Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences, wherein said user attribute information includes hierarchical levels (See Fig. 4 Step 34, Fig. 8 Col. 6 lines 17-52, Col. 8 lines 5-65 x (Top level) is determined based on sum of A's (lower level)), wherein at least a portion of said user attribute information include preference elements characterized by a set selected from at least the following (See Col. 7 lines 37-64 and Col. 8 lines 1-51) Preference elements are weights in Graves system): (i) a neutral preference indicating indifference to said preference element (See Fig. 5 Not Appropriate); (ii) a nominal preference indicating at least one of desire for and disdain of said preference element (See Fig. 5 Preferences can be ranked 1-10); (iii) a maximally preference indicating said preference element is to be selected (See Fig. 5 Preferences can receive a maximal ranking); (iv) a minimal preference (See Fig. 5 Preferences be given a minimal ranking); (b) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of audio and video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); and (c) selecting, in response to receiving said user attribute information and said program attribute information, at least one of said audio and video based upon said preference elements (See Col. 6 lines 17-52). Graves fails

to disclose where the minimal preference indicates said preference element is not to be selected. However, having a user reject certain preferences that contribute the to the ranking of a program is well known in the art as taught by Herz (See Col. 10 lines 51-60). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Graves so that weights could take on the value of zero thereby allowing a user to reject certain preferences used to evaluate programs as taught by Herz in order to give the user more control in evaluating programs.

72. Regarding claim **18**, Graves modified with Herz teaches said user attribute information including preference elements characterized by at least one additional preference (See Herz Col. 10 lines 51-60 weights can take on values 0-10 and negative values. This is more than five values).

73. Regarding claim **40**, Graves teaches wherein said characteristic includes said the number of times that a preselected set of preferences, corresponds with said program attribute information, wherein said at least one of said audio and video receives a higher ranking with an increasing said number (See Col. 5 lines 6-9 See Col. 8 Eqn. 1 The amount of time an actor is on screen determines the A value. The higher the A value, the higher the x value (ranking)), further characterized by: (a) said preselected set of preferences includes a first preference and a second preference, wherein said ranking is based upon an or functionality between said first preference and said second preference (See Fig. 5 Col. 8 lines 5-68, Col. 9 lines 3, See Col. 8 37-43). Graves differs from the claimed invention in that Graves system typically weights and adds up all of said preferences $i = (1 \text{ to } n)$. However, having a user reject certain preferences that

Art Unit: 2616

contribute the to the ranking of a program is well known in the art see Herz (See Col. 10 lines 51-60). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Graves so that weights could take on the value of zero thereby allowing a user to select a set of preference categories to be used to evaluate programs as taught by Herz to give the user more control evaluating programs.

74. Regarding claim **41**, Graves modified with Herz teaches wherein said program attribute information includes preference values indicating the amount of said preferences (See Graves Col. 4 lines 64-68, Col. 5 lines 1-5).

75. Regarding claim **42**, Graves modified with Herz teaches wherein said preference values are used as the basis of said ranking said at least one of audio and video (See Graves Col. 8 lines 5-65).

76. Regarding claim **43**, Graves modified with Herz teaches wherein said ranking includes just slightly more is better combination (See Graves Col. 6 lines 17-52 Choosing programs with a larger grade is the same as a just slightly more is better combination).

77. Regarding claim **44**, Graves modified with Herz teaches wherein said ranking includes a strong preference is better combination (See Graves Col. 8 Eqn. 1 A strong preference would make a weight higher which in turn would give a higher ranking to a program).

78. Regarding claim **45-49**, claims **45-49** are analyzed and rejected in discussion with claims **40-44**, respectively.

79. Regarding claim **50**, Graves teaches a method for selecting at least one of audio and video comprising (See Abstract): (a) receiving user attribute information corresponding to user preferences (See Col. 5 lines 44-68, Col. 6 lines 1-16); (b) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of a first audio and first video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52); (c) receiving program attribute information corresponding to said at least one of a second audio and second video (See Fig. 4 Step 34 Col. 6 lines 17-52 This step is done for a plurality of programs); and (d) ranking said at least one of said first audio and first video, and, said at least one of said second audio and second video, in response to receiving said user attribute information and said program attribute information for said at least one of said first audio and first video, and, said at least one of said second audio and second video (See Col. 6 lines 17-52). Graves fails to disclose where program attribute weights can take on negative values. However, using negative program attribute weights in television program ranking systems is well known in that art as taught by Herz (See Col. 10 lines 31-63 cv is equivalent to Graves' w). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Graves so that user could assign negative values to attribute weights as taught by Herz to allow the user to express a level of aversion to a program attribute (See Herz Col. 10 lines 60-63).

80. Regarding claim **51**, Graves modified with Herz teaches wherein said ranking determines said first video as more desirable for said user than said second video (See Graves Fig. 4 Step 42d Col. 6 lines 17-52).

81. Regarding claim **52**, Graves modified with Herz teaches wherein said ranking determines said second video as more desirable for another user than said first video (See Graves Fig. 4 Step 42c Col. 6 lines 17-52).

82. Regarding claim **53**, Graves modified with Herz teaches wherein said ranking is in a relativistic manner (See Col. 6 lines 17-52).

83. Claim **56, 59** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graves.

84. Regarding claim **56**, Graves teaches wherein said evaluating is based upon a summation operation (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1). From the specification the AND function is an averaging function (Page 131 lines 13-14), the result of Graves summation divided by the number of elements summed (n). The examiner takes Official Notice that averaging to normalize a set of numbers is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Graves so that the result of his summation equation was divided by the number of elements added together to create normalized grades.

85. Regarding claim **59**, Graves teaches wherein said evaluating is based upon a summation operation (See Col. 8 Eqn. 1). From the specification the AND function is an averaging function (Page 131 lines 13-14), the result of Graves summation divided by the number of elements summed (n). The examiner takes Official Notice that averaging to normalize a set of numbers is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Graves so that the result of his summation equation was divided by the number of elements added together to create normalized grades.


Conclusion

86. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamieson W. Fish whose telephone number is 571-272-7307. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

87. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's primary, Ngoc Vu can be reached on 571-272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

88. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JF 3/31/2005


NGOC-YEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER